

STATE TICKET.
For Governor,
STEPHEN ROYCE, of Berkshire.
For Lieutenant Governor,
RYLAND FLETCHER, of Cavendish.
For Treasurer,
HENRY M. BATES, of Northfield.

COUNTY TICKET.
For Senators,
KRASUS B. WATSON, New Haven,
ROLLIN J. JONES, Cornwall.
For Assistant Judges,
L. D. GREGORY, Weybridge,
OLIVER SMITH, New Haven.
For Sheriff,
DAVID R. CURRIE, Middlebury.
For State's Attorney,
F. E. WOODBRIDGE, Vergennes.
For High Sheriff,
GAUS A. COLLAMER, Bristol.
For Judge of Probate, Addition District,
ROBERT BEYMOUD, Middlebury.
For Judge of Probate, New Haven District,
HARVEY NUNNELL, Bristol.

Re-nomination of Mr. Meacham.—Speech of Judge Phelps.
The District Convention, at this place, last Thursday, did what every one expected, in re-nominating Mr. MEACHAM. So universal was this expectation and desire, that comparatively few attended the convention, knowing the nomination was safe in the hands of Mr. Meacham's friends at home. Indeed, the propriety of this course, with its present advantages, seems to be the feeling of the people, and as the most emphatic approval possible of the course of our Representative during the last session, was manifest. There can be no doubt of his election by a most decisive majority.

We regret that a much larger number of our citizens could not have been present to listen to the speech of Judge PHELPS, which was one of the best of his occasional speeches that we have ever heard. It should be written out and published, as full of sound statesmanship and of practical wisdom and foresight, eminently adapted to the times. Judge PHELPS spoke very emphatically in reprobation of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; declaring that it had done what Clay, Webster and their compatriots had labored to accomplish, and by destroying all mutual confidence between the North and South, had rendered sectionalism inevitable. He deemed the measure most unfortunate and ill-judged for the South, as well as false to the North and to freedom.

Judge PHELPS dwelt at some length on the inevitable difficulties that are to arise from a constant addition of new territory, with all the evils of a mixed, heterogeneous population, impossible to be brought into unity of custom, sympathy and institutions. He gave a scathing exposure of the imbecility of the present Administration and of the mischievousness of its aims and practices, and strongly deprecated the nomination, for the highest office in the government, of secondary men and party tools.

He spoke with much force and pertinency on the Protective policy, which we were in danger of losing sight of altogether, in the pressure of other more exciting issues. We could not continue, for a long time, to send abroad millions on millions of specie annually, over and above our receipts, without experiencing the effects. A crash must necessarily come.

The speech of which our outline of course gives no adequate idea—was received with repeated applause. It was an address that, just at this juncture, should be heard in every part of our state and through the land.

BENNINGTON COUNTY.—The following Anti-Nebraska County ticket was nominated at Arlington, on the 26th ult.:
For Senators, LEONARD SARGANT, Manchester, NORMAN MILLINGTON, Shaftsbury; Asst. Judges, SAM. H. BROWN, Bennington, JOSIAH S. THOMAS, Sandgate; State's Attorney, J. L. STARK, Jr., Bennington; Sheriff, JESSE VIAL, Dorset; Judges of Probate, ALEXANDER BLISS, Manchester District, CHARLES HICKS, Bennington District.

THIRD DISTRICT.—There is to be a convention at St. Albans, Aug. 15th, of the free men of the third congressional district who are in favor of the platform adopted at Rutland June 7th and at Montpelier July 13th, to nominate a candidate for member of Congress. Hon. ALVAN BARNHART will undoubtedly be re-nominated.

ANOTHER FIGHT.—Mike Walsh got a drubbing in the House Post Office, on the 1st inst., from Mr. Seward of Georgia, whom he had called a liar, with a profane epithet prefixed. Mike's face was badly marked up. These agreeable diversions serve to pass the time of honorable members, and are highly creditable to the country—to those who engage in them, most especially.

COMMENCEMENT AT BURLINGTON.—Twenty-six young men received the degree of A. B., at Burlington, last Wednesday, and ten the degree of A. M. The exercises of the graduating class were quite creditable. One of the orations in which we were most interested was that of Mr. Sanford, of Orwell.

WE owe no apology to anonymous correspondents for leaving their communications unnoticed. Give your name when you write.

Congress adjourned Monday. The ten million bill was defeated, and the River and Harbor bill vetoed.

A correspondent of the National Era says:—We have now some ten or twelve anti-slavery churches established in Kentucky, in good condition, and there are few but admit that the time is not far distant when Kentucky will be free. May God speed the day!

There is a good seed in Kentucky, and if it be permitted to ripen in its own time a beautiful harvest will be realized. If the slaveholders of that State were to be let alone by the abolitionists for ten years, Kentucky, would be a free State in 1865. We believe the same is true of Delaware and Maryland, and perhaps Virginia.—Troy Whig.

Congressional Convention.—First District. District Convention met at the Court House in Middlebury, agreeably to call, on the 3d day of August, 1854.
The Convention was called to order by Gen. Geo. W. Grandey, on whose nomination Hon. SAMUEL S. PHELPS was chosen President.

On motion of Joseph Warner, Esq., the following gentlemen were appointed Vice Pres., Hon. Harvey Munsell, David Love, Esq., John Simonds, Esq., Hon. Joel Rice.

On motion of J. S. Bushnell, Esq., the Convention chose, as Secretaries, E. E. Grosvenor, Edwin Everts.

On motion of Mr. Barrett, it was voted, That a committee of five be appointed, by the Chair, to report Resolutions for the consideration of the Convention.

The Chair appointed, to constitute such committee, the following persons, viz: Joseph H. Barrett, C. H. Hayden, H. G. Judd, Asa Chapman, John B. Huntley.

On motion of Gen. Grandey—who expressed his belief that there were but one opinion and expectation throughout the district, regarding the Congressional nomination at the present time—it was unanimously

Totest, That the convention proceed to nominate, viva voce, a candidate for Representative in the next Congress of the United States.

Thereupon, on motion of C. H. Hayden, Esq., of Rutland County, seconded by J. I. C. Cook, Esq., of Bennington County,

Hon. JAMES MEACHAM, of Middlebury, was unanimously nominated as such candidate.

Voted, That a committee of three be appointed by the Chair to wait on Mr. Meacham, to apprise him of his nomination, and to request his presence in the Convention.

The Chair appointed Messrs. Hayden, Cook and Grandey as such committee.

Mr. Barrett, for the Committee on Resolutions, reported the following:

Resolved, That we cordially approve the platform adopted by the State Convention at Rutland, on the 7th of June, and that we reaffirm the same, as protecting the true interests before the people in the approaching Congressional election.

Resolved, That we invite the cordial cooperation of all citizens of this district who would sustain our present able Representative in his noble and earnest opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the aggressions of the propagandists of Slavery, that his reelection may be secured by a vote as emphatic as the Anti-Nebraska sentiment of his constituents.

Mr. MEACHAM, having been waited on by the committee appointed for that purpose, appeared in the convention, and after signifying his grateful acceptance of the nomination made an able and very satisfactory address on the first resolution.

The question being taken on the resolutions, each was unanimously adopted.

The convention was then addressed by the President, Hon. S. S. PHELPS, in answer to a general call, on the prominent political topics of the day.

Brief addresses were also made, in response to call, by J. M. Slado, C. H. Hayden, Hon. E. D. Warner, G. W. Grandey, and others.

The convention then adjourned, sine die. S. S. PHELPS, President. E. E. GROSVENOR, Secretary.

CONDITION OF PARTIES.—The Baltimore Patriot, in an article on the present condition of the Whig party, says that "it depends upon the action of the Northern Whigs whether the party shall be disorganized by the withdrawal of Southern Whigs or not; and that if the Northern Whigs shall depart from the platform of principle, and seek an alliance with Free Soilers and Democrats upon the sole and destructive issue of sectional conflict, all political alliances with them is at an end." Upon this the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette remarks:—

"The Whig party of the South will maintain its integrity—let others do as they will. It wants no sectional issues, it seeks no sectional divisions, and it will not recognize as Whigs those who, uniting with fanatics and agitators, would strike a blow at our institutions and our interests in violation of right and justice. Our hope is that the sound and conservative Whigs of the North may be able yet to defeat the efforts there making to draw strength to the Free Soil party, and thus preserve a National Whig party, free from the taint of Abolitionism or opposition to the Constitution, and devoted only to what are the true principles of true Whigs, the limitation of executive power, the reform of federal abuses, the protection of popular and state rights, and the maintenance of conservative views in the administration of the government, both with regard to our foreign relations and our domestic concerns. We will wait patiently to see if our hopes are to be realized or disappointed. We wish to preserve not to destroy—to strengthen and elevate the Whig party, North and South."

The Whig party, North and South, almost always take a slight local color when sectional questions are about to be considered, and its members fly from the dominion of party very easily under the cry of sectionalism.

At the present time, no Northern Whig ranges himself in favor of the Nebraska business, and the Southern Whigs who do so take this ground only from sectional pressure. The Southern Whigs who endorse the repeal of the Missouri Compromise cannot but know that their action is in opposition to every conservative principle of the party to which they profess to belong—is a violation of sectional agreements which should not be disturbed. The Whigs South and the Whigs North have sectional prejudices—neither can prevent these—but the Southern Whigs should remember that Douglas's Nebraska bill, which was unpalatable to many of them,

was a very bitter dose to their brethren of the North—a dose which, thus far, the latter have not been able to digest.—Boston Courier.

Southern Whig papers, that sanction the Nebraska treachery, may well abstain from lecturing on sectionalism. We want their advice as little as their fellowship.

The Northern Kidnappers. The Northrup Kidnappers are likely "to do the State some service." The evidence against them appears to be conclusive; and they are likely to end their base career by TEN YEARS OF SLAVERY in the penitentiary. The case presents many remarkable features. A worthy, intelligent and industrious citizen of this State.

"Guilty of a skin not colored like our own." Is decry to the capital of the nation, is there dragged, and while insolent is dragged to a slave pen, sold, cruelly beaten, and ultimately consigned to the obscurest section of the Red River region.—Twelve years he is subjected to the severe rigors of the slave system; when, by a concurrence of the most singular events, he is found out and rescued, by an agent acting under a commission from the Governor of this State.

He returns, publishes a most interesting narrative of the scenes and sufferings through which he has passed, entitled *Southern Northrup*; or, *Twelve Years a Slave*, which is by far more than a mere tale of horrors, and which evokes their warmest sympathies in his behalf. No one, however, expects to find the guilty perpetrators of the base outrage. But they are found, and a host of the most creditable witnesses rise up as if by magic to prove their identity and their guilt. The whole case is certainly the most remarkable on record, and it can only be appreciated by reading the "narrative" in connection with the incidents of the arrest and detention of the Kidnappers.—*Amherst Daily Adv.*

A FAIR PRIZE.—The editor of the *Vermont Tribune* gives a thrilling account of a fugitive slave who has just been captured through Vermont to Canada. He says: "He is 30 years of age, tall, well-formed, and of far more than ordinary intelligence, able to read fluently, a member of the Methodist Church, and the daughter of her master's father, Rufin Gilchrist, of Easton, Md., because he had sold her to a South Carolina for \$1100. This Rufin had sold his own flesh and blood for so much real cash, and but for his daughter's shrewdness and her own blood now have been finding the price of blood. Charlotte the fugitive, was a free, lay secreted in the woods eighteen days, found by a Quaker in Philadelphia by railroad, by a mode we dare not tell lest it should involve him in trouble. Her long exposure and dreadful journey to Philadelphia brought on a fever, from the effects of which she had not recovered when here at St. Albans. From Philadelphia to Boston by sea, thence to Maine, and then to avoid some bloodthirsty Southerners who were on her track, she turned her steps this way, avoiding her pursuers with her friends all the way, good accommodations on the U. R. R., with the money given her here, she went on her way to the only land where she could breathe free. God protect and guide her."

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW IN WISCONSIN.—We have heard that the opinion of our Supreme Court in the case of the appeal of the federal officers from the decision of Judge Smith in the habeas corpus case, was given yesterday morning, sustaining Judge Smith's decision, Judge Crawford dissenting. The opinion of the court was given by Chief Justice Whiton and rests mainly on two grounds: the insufficiency of the commitment, and the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave act in delegating to court commissioners the power to determine in cases arising under the act. Justice Crawford, we learn, concurred with his brethren in holding that S. M. Booth was properly discharged from arrest and that the writ of habeas corpus was rightly granted, but dissented from the view taken of the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave act.—*Milwaukee Sentinel*, July 20.

MR. R. C. DOWNING, Sanitary Inspector of New York, has been investigating the condition of some of the cow-stalls in that city. He has found them unventilated, close and filthy, and the poor animals in them suffering from the foulness of the atmosphere and the nature of their food, which is distillery waste, brought from the distillery Messrs. Johnson & Co., in pipes. The cows are owned by several persons, each of whom milks his own cattle and distributes milk to his customers. In one case Mr. Downing saw a man mixing burnt sugar with the milk just drawn from the sickly, gasping beasts, in order to give it a creamy color. All about the stables were freshly-painted, clean, rural looking wagons, marked with the names of various counties, to cheat the people into the belief that New York milk comes from the country parts.

A curious fact has leaked out as to Mr. Bolon Boland, while at San Juan. It is asserted that he organized a military force to maintain honor to the United States, concentrated in his person, as well as for his self-protection, and paid them about \$12,000, for which he drew on the government, but the draft has not yet been paid. Probably this amount is included in the \$24,000 demanded by Captain Hollins of the citizens of San Juan.—*Cor. N. Y. Herald*.

The New York Herald, a devoted Democratic Nebraska paper, passes the following dubious compliment upon the Democracy:—

The doctrines of the Maine Liquor law are not applicable to New Hampshire. The untutored Democracy of the Granite State are not to be frightened by drugged liquor. The coalitionists have defeated them on the printer, and on the Senator; but not on the liquor question. Thus the New Hampshire Democracy are firm.

THE Anti-Maine Law men of HARTFORD are firm in the faith that since tripping has been outlawed in that city for Liquors should be sold in that city for medicinal, mechanical or sacramental purposes. We are, for a wonder, for once in accord with them, and hope they may succeed. We don't believe Health, Industry or Religion would suffer one jot from the complete banishment, or even annihilation of Alcohol.

CONGRESS.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2.
SENATE.—In the Senate, Mr. Silldell offered a resolution, continuing the business of the Senate, and before committee, and undisturbed at this session until the next session. Adopted.

Mr. Butler, from the Judiciary Committee, reported that Mr. Williams from New Hampshire is not entitled to hold his seat any longer. Report laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Fish, from the Select Committee on causes of morality on board emigrant vessels, reported a bill for the better preparation of life on board vessels. The bill granting the right of way to the Marysville and Benicia Railroad through certain public ground in California, was passed.

Mr. Hunter moved to take up the Post-office Appropriation bill. Mr. Mason wanted an executive session.

Mr. Hunter's motion was agreed to—19 to 17. Hunter said that for some years he had refused to pass any legislation bill; this one had passed by only three majority. The Committee had conceded that to secure its passage no amendment should be made to it. The bill was passed—35 to 9.

Several amendments were adopted, among them the following:—that the mail steamer between Charleston, Key West and Havana be continued during August and September as it is other months; allowing the Postoffice of Washington to be continued in regular operation on the public documents sent through the Postoffice, out of which commission he is to pay his employers increased compensation of \$25 each, per year.

Amendments for the transportation of semi-monthly mails via Vera Cruz and Acapulco to California, and for a weekly mail to Panama, were rejected. The bill was reported to the Senate, and the amendments made in Committee of the Whole were concurred in. An amendment for a mail between Cairo, Illinois, and New Orleans, was agreed to. The bill was then read a third time and passed.

The Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation bill was then taken up. Mr. Hunter moved that the Senate insist on its amendments, and asked a Committee of Conference. Agreed to, and a committee appointed.

It was then ordered that the Senate meet for the rest of the session at 10 A. M. Mr. Mason at 3 1/2 o'clock, moved for an Executive session—agreed to. The doors were opened at half past six o'clock. Mr. Stuart offered the following:—Resolved, the House agreeing, that the time fixed by the resolution of July 1, for the adjournment of the present session of Congress, be, and the same is hereby extended to—

Mr. Hunter reported the Naval Appropriation bill without amendment. It was taken up, but without action the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE.—The House passed several Senate bills. On motion of Mr. Walley the House concurred in the Senate amendment to the bill providing for the temporary accommodation of the United States Courts in Boston, New York and Philadelphia.

The General Appropriation bill was taken up. The Senate amendment appropriating \$35,000 to reimburse Ed. and Riddle, for sums expended by him on account of his official position at the London Industrial Exhibition, was rejected—57 to 55.

Mr. Letcher moved the Senate amendments be laid on the table. The Speaker said if this should prevail, the bill would be carried with it. The question was decided in the negative, 70 to 113. The bill was then returned to the Senate.

Mr. Hinton of New York moved the River and Harbor bill, as amended by the Senate, be referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The House refused to suspend the rules, 92 against 76. Not two thirds.

Mr. Duncan moved that the House proceed to the business on the Speaker's table, with a view to take up the Homestead bill. The motion failed, 81 against 83.

The House adjourned at half past 3 o'clock.

SHALL WE Annex a Piece of Russia? We have been talking of annexing Cuba, and Canada, and Mexico, and Honduras, and a part of New Grenada; but it is not unlikely that we shall have annexed a piece of Russia before any of them. It has been announced that a Russian agent is now in Washington, for the purpose of negotiating the cession of these States of Russia, America, and the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same confused interpretation of treaties between 1821, 1824 and 1834, between the Russian government and our own. The Russian government took the position of the fisheries along the north-west coast of this continent. As regards these fisheries, it latterly seemed as if they were about to become a great cause of debate and trouble as those on the north-east coast of America. There was the same